



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,088	03/08/2001	Paul Duxbury	190-1472	8516
23644	7590	05/05/2005	EXAMINER	
BARNES & THORNBURG P.O. BOX 2786 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/803,088	DUXBURY, PAUL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Quoc A. Tran	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4-10 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 4-10 and 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/27/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to Amendment A filed 10/08/2004.
2. Claims 4-10 and 13-18 are pending. Applicants amended claims 4-10 and cancelled claims 1-3 and 11-12 and added claims 13-18. Claims 13, 15 and 17 are independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 13, 15 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Lynch et al. US006558431B1- filed 09/11/1998 (hereinafter Lynch).

**In regard to independent claims 13, 15 and 17, (a) parsing the input document to generate an alternative representation of the input document in a second code form ((in Lynch col. 4 lines 40-50) in which end tags are implicit (as taught by Lynch col. 6, lines 10-15);**

**(b) truncating said alternative representation** (as described by Lynch col. 1, lines 39-51, examiner reads, when user edits or manipulating the document, wherein the manipulating or editing required remove/adding/truncating the format from the text in the editor regenerates the HTML document, which could interpreted as claimed “truncating”);

**(c) using the truncated alternative representation to generate an output document in said first coded form, (in Lynch col. 1, lines 39-51), said output document including any explicit end tags necessary to ensure that the output document is well-formed (as taught by Lynch col. 5, lines 5-28);**

**(d) displaying the output document (as described by Lynch col. 1, lines 50-60); means for storing an input document (as taught by Lynch col. 3, lines 50-55) said input document being in a first coded form containing explicit pairs of tags and end tags (as taught by Lynch col. 3, lines 40-50, also as illustrated in Fig. 8B through Fig. 10 the process of editing the invalid HTML tags, then normalizing process of using text mark up tags around block tags (e.g. bold around paragraph), A tags inside other A tags, etc, which could interpreted as claimed “explicit pairs of tags and end tags”).**

5. **Claims 4-5, 8-10, 14 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Lynch.

**In regard to dependent claims 4, wherein the input document is an HTML document, including HTML tags (as taught by Lynch col. 4, lines 40-50).**

**In regard to dependent claim 5, wherein the input document includes embedded command tags, identifying information to be inserted into the input document when it is rendered (as taught by Lynch col. 4, lines 40-50).**

**In regard to dependent claim 8, including inserting locator markers in the display of the partial output, each locator marker indicating the location of material that was generated from a particular command tag (as taught by Lynch col. 4, lines 59-65).**

**In regard to dependent claim 9, wherein selecting one of the locator markers automatically rewinds the display to the command tag corresponding to that marker (as taught by Lynch col. 3, lines 39-45, examiner reads user can choose to have all correctable invalid HTML be automatically rewritten (not preserved) to make it fully valid, and supports most common types of invalid structures such as text mark up tags around block tags (e.g. bold around paragraph), A tags inside other A tags etc, which could interpreted as claimed).**

**In regard to dependent claim 10, wherein any locator marker corresponding to a command tag embedded within a link is queued until the link in which it is embedded closes (as taught by Lynch col. 2, lines 30-45, examiner reads user depicts another aspect of the problem shown in FIG. 3, i.e. the structure of the original document is not well preserved. In FIG. 4A, the editor corrects overlapping tags 401, so that tags are in order 402 from the inside out. FIG. 4B depicts a list item that is not in the list 403. In this case, the editor will place UL tags 404 around the item; FIG. 5 depicts a prior art editor that maintains a copy 502 of the original document 501 during a portion of the processing. After the editor loads and parses the document 501 into tree 503, the editor maintains copy 502. However, when edited 504, the document 502 is reformatted and restructured, which could interpreted as claimed.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable by Lynch et al. US006558431B1 – filed- 09/11/1998 (hereinafter Lynch), in view of Donohue et al. US Patent No. 5,987,480 - filed 07/26/1996 (hereinafter Donohue).**

**In regard to dependent claim 6, including keeping a count of the number of embedded command tags that have been executed during rendering (as taught by Lynch col. 7, lines 50-55);**

Lynch does not explicitly teach, **and terminating the rendering when said count reaches a predetermined value**, however Donohue teaches in one aspect, wherein web site developers and publishers using the template scheme of the present invention will not be required to design and store templates for every conceivable path in the directory, but may rather design only a limited number of templates which are used in a number of circumstances, see col. 5, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified teaching of Donohue, wherein web site developers and publishers

using the template scheme of the present invention will not be required to design and store templates for every conceivable path in the directory, but may rather design only a limited number of templates which are used in a number of circumstances into the teaching of Lynch that shows the debugging tool of HTML input document, to provide a way wherein terminating the rendering when said count reaches a predetermined value. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow web authors to edit HTML visually while preserving the HTML source document, also maintains structure while editing, as the structure and format of the document is only minimally modified during editing, i.e. only the nodes affected by the edits are restructured and reformatted, and the remainder of the document is unmodified, (see Donohue at the Abstract).

**In regard to dependent claim 7, method according to claim 6, wherein the embedded command tags include loop commands defining at least one loop, and wherein said count is incremented each time the loop is executed** (however Donohue discloses in one aspect of his invention wherein designing of HTML document by inserting tags or by using an HTML editors were utilizing, see col. 10, lines 10-15; further more Donohue also discloses in another aspect of his invention, wherein the names in the LOOP instruction can be represented as arrays, with the values being sequentially incremented through the use of well-known techniques such as array indexing or pointer arithmetic, see col. 9, lines 20-25);

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified teaching of Donohue, wherein designing of HTML document by inserting tags or by using an HTML editors utilizing the LOOP instruction with the values being sequentially incremented into the teaching of Lynch that shows the debugging tool of HTML

input document, to provide a way wherein the embedded command tags include loop commands defining at least one loop, and wherein said count is incremented each time the loop is executed. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow web authors to edit HTML visually while preserving the HTML source document, also maintains structure while editing, as the structure and format of the document is only minimally modified during editing, i.e. only the nodes affected by the edits are restructured and reformatted, and the remainder of the document is unmodified, (see Donohue at the Abstract).

### ***Response to Argument***

8. Examiner has completed a through study of Applicant's Amendments of 10/08/2004, has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

---

*Quoc A. Tran*  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2176  
April 20, 2005



SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER